DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 877 SP 006 558

AUTHOR	Restad, Raymond O.
TITLE	A Survey of Attitudes Held By School Administrators Toward Blind Teacher Applicants.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	72p.; M.S. Thesis, Moorhead State College
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Blind; Educational Research; Elementary Education; *Employer Attitudes; Secondary Education; *Teacher Employment; *Visually Handicapped

ABSTRACT

This study focused on the general attitudes held by school administrators toward the blind teacher. A two-part questionnaire, consisting of 13 descriptive items and a 10-item attitude scale, was completed by 553 elementary and secondary school administrators in the state of Minnesota. A frequency distribution was compiled to show degrees of attitudes and a Chi-Square analysis was made to compare groups of administrators. Attitudes were compared on the basis of administrator's age, highest degree held, geographic area from which the degree was earned, the type of school where the administrator was located, the level of his school, the population of the community in which he worked, and the degree of experience he had working with blind teachers. The responses indicated a positive attitude toward blind teachers. The level of education of the administrators and the degree of experience they had working with blind teachers were the two factors which resulted in differentiating attitudes. Administrators with the most education tended to be more positive in their view of employing teachers. Administrators with prior experience with blind teachers also tended to be more positive. (The survey questionnaire and 22 tables of statistical data are included.) (Author/BRB)

ED 077877

A SURVEY OF ATTITUDES HELD BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD BLIND TEACHER APPLICANTS

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Moorhead State College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

(Social Studies--Sociology)

by

Raymond O. Restad

August 1972

SP 006 558

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 2

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 2

DEFINITION OF TERMS 3

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 4

HISTORY OF EDUCATION FOR THE BLIND 4

SOME FORCES CAUSING CHANGE IN ATTITUDES 7

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED 7

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE 14

3. METHODS 16

THE QUESTIONNAIRE 17

THE SAMPLE 19

THE STATISTICAL COMPUTATIONS 20

4. FINDINGS 23

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION 56

SUMMARY 56

CONCLUSION 59

RECOMMENDATION 60

Page

APPENDIXES 61

A. Cover Letter 62

B. Survey Questionnaire 63

BIBLIOGRAPHY 66

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

1. Number and Percentage of Responses to Each Degree of Attitude 24

2. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Age 25

3. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Age 27

4. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Age 28

5. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of Education 29

6. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of Education 31

7. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of Education 32

8. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Geographical Area in Which Degree Was Received . . . 34

9. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Geographical Area in Which Degree Was Received . . . 35

10. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Geographical Area in Which Degree Was Received . . . 36

11. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Type of School 38

Table | Page

12. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Type of School 39

13. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Type of School 41

14. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of School 42

15. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of School 43

16. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of School 45

17. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Population of Community 46

18. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Population of Community 48

19. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Population of Community 49

20. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Experience Working with Blind Teachers 51

21. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Experience Working with Blind Teachers 52

22. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Experience Working with Blind Teachers 54

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

After World War II there were many handicapped veterans who needed special training toward rehabilitation. To accomplish this, a new course of study evolved which prepared competent therapists. When the results of this rehabilitation program could be seen, enthusiasm developed toward a more active rehabilitation program effort for all handicapped persons, not just war veterans.

As federal and state funds became available for the rehabilitation facilities, and people became qualified to staff these, one of their primary goals was to rehabilitate all handicapped persons classified as trainable.

Special agencies at both federal and state levels were set up to work with the rehabilitation of the blind. The best-known national agencies are the American Foundation for the Blind, located in New York City, and the American Printing House for the Blind, in Louisville, Kentucky. A division of the Library of Congress produces and distributes recorded books for the blind which are called "Talking Books."

Each state has a department responsible for providing assistance to the blind. In Minnesota there are case workers who work directly as counselors with individuals. The Communications Center, as a unit of the State Services for the Blind, records, catalogs, and distributes textbooks for blind students.

Part of the duties of the counselors is to help a blind person in career planning. This includes evaluating of the individual as to his aptitudes and interests, reviewing available training facilities, and considering occupational opportunities.

In planning a career there are generally three areas of concentration. First there is the evaluation of the client, then training and education facilities must be arranged for, and finally there must be an employer.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Through testing and counseling it is possible to determine a reasonable evaluation of the client. With the funds, facilities, and trained personnel available, the training and education of the client can be carried forth. The final step is to find employment for the client. Without actualizing this final step, rehabilitation has not been accomplished.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study was undertaken to determine if the image portrayed to a prospective employer by the rehabilitated person who is ready to take his place in society is stronger than the prejudice held against the handicapped individual. Specifically, when a blind person is accepted as a teacher-training candidate, is there reasonable probability of employment after the successful completion of the training program? This study was undertaken to find information on the probability of employment.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Rehabilitation: "To restore to a state of health, useful activity, etc., through training, therapy, guidance"[1]

Administrator: The ranking administrative authority on the physical location of any school surveyed in this study

Blind: Reference to a visual handicap of total blindness, or partial vision not to exceed 20/200 centeral acuity as defined in legal blindness

Mobility: Referring to physical mobility; to move about from one place to another

Evaluate: To appraise by testing and counseling the physical and mental aptitudes and personality characteristics of a client

Level of School: Elementary, junior high, or senior high

---

[1]Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1967, p. 1134.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study was designed to test the attitudes of school administrators toward a category of persons with a common characteristic, that of blindness. Attitudes are learned behavioral traits, and experiences of one kind or another can establish, strengthen, modify, or change one's attitude toward a given idea or subject. The degree of strength of an attitude may change the name of the concept. Ideas, beliefs, biases, values, and opinions are examples of related concepts. Whatever name is used to describe the concept, it is still an attitude that can be observed in the subject's behavior.

This writer feels attitudes are slow to change. To illustrate this point, the history of education for the blind is presented in the following section.

HISTORY OF EDUCATION FOR THE BLIND

The first organized school for the blind was established in Paris in 1785. Prior to this time the blind had not been considered educable. Other schools in Europe were patterned after the one in Paris, and by the early 1830's one was started in the United States. The first school for this purpose in the United States was known as "The New England Asylum for the Purpose of Educating the Blind";

this school was later to become known as "The Perkins Institution for the Blind."[1]

Greater concern for the blind as humans can be seen by curriculum planning in 1832. When Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe accepted the directorship of the Boston School for the Blind, he emphasized the following points:

> 1. Each blind child must be considered as an individual and be trained in accordance with his personal ability and opportunity to use the training in his community.
>
> 2. The curriculum for the blind should be well rounded and conform as far as possible to that of the common school, but more music and craft should be provided.
>
> 3. The main objective must be to train youth to be able to take their places in the social and economic life in their home communities as contributing members.[2]

Another source states Dr. Howe's philosophy of educating the blind in these words:

> The object of his comprehensive system was to unfold the mental faculties and strengthen the bodily powers of the blind in definite order. To cultivate in them the aesthetic element and prepare them for a liberal profession, to train them in industrious and virtuous habits; to develop to the utmost extent all their faculties and aptitudes; and lastly, to make them hearty and self reliant so that they might go out into the world, not to eat the bread of charity, but to earn a livelihood by honest work.[3]

---

[1]Harry Best, History of Education of the Blind in the United States (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934), pp. 307-308.

[2]Gabriel Farrell, The Story of Blindness (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 45.

[3]Hector Chuvigny and Sidel Braverman, The Adjustment of the Blind (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 97.

The early schools for the blind were all residential. It was not until the latter part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century that education and training began providing for the needs of blind students. It had become evident that to achieve the goals set forth by Dr. Howe and others, the student would have to have the experience of associating with students of all walks of life and varying abilities. This idea has progressed to where there is now a range of schools. These schools for the blind include residential segregated schools, the partially integrated public schools with special resource persons, and the fully integrated public schools equipped with a resource room where special skills and techniques can be used.[4]

It would be difficult to determine exactly what the motivating force has been, but this writer feels a blind person has a much better opportunity to achieve a more satisfying life than did the blind of nearly a century ago, but the blind have come from a position of helplessness to a place of relative independence and self actualization. Having this greater opportunity at finding a social and vocational place for themselves, the blind have developed a confidence that seems to draw from the public an attitude of acceptance.

---

[4]Burthold Lowenfeld, "The Social Impact of Blindness upon the Individual," The New Outlook for the Blind, Vol. 58, No. 9, November, 1964, pp. 273-277.

SOME FORCES CAUSING CHANGE IN ATTITUDES

Perhaps one of the strongest influences in changing attitudes toward the blind is the effort put forth by the blind themselves. They have been taking advantage of the educational and training opportunities made available to them. It is now possible to find blind persons at work in some area of almost every occupation. They do not function in specific jobs in which sight is a prime factor but by utilizing their skills and talents they have found constructive work in nearly every field. Besides working in arts, crafts, music, literature, and education, the blind are found to be working in such unlikely fields as chemistry, physics, mathematics, electronics, mechanics, sales, and law, just to mention a few.[5]

Because we accept the idea that attitudes are learned; and for any change to occur, there must be certain influencing factors, this writer believes that, among others, the mass media plays a significant role. Radio, television, and newspapers, for instance, frequently give accounts of accomplishments by the blind.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

There has been much emphasis placed on the training and education for useful vocations; little has been written about the employment

---

[5]Mary K. Bauman and Norman M. Yoder, Placing the Blind and Visually Handicapped in Professional Occupations (Washington, D.C.: Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), March 1, 1962.

of the handicapped persons once the training has been completed. Agencies and commissions have been set up to promote employment of the handicapped persons, but the fact remains that these organizations are not employers. The President's Commission on Hiring the Handicapped and the state commission set up for the same purpose usually consist of people of prominence. These commission members lend their names to promotional projects such as radio and television commercials and newspaper displays.

Success in achieving employment seems to depend on the attitudes of employers toward handicapped people. These attitudes tend to be based on employers' life experiences and the work reputations attained by the employed handicapped people themselves. From the literature reviewed, it seems that the handicapped persons who are deemed trained and qualified to do a job have about the same rate of success as persons not afflicted with an obvious handicap.

Ronald I. Johnston, a vocational guidance counselor for the blind in the division of vocational rehabilitation is a former mathematics teacher who now works full-time as a consultant for the blind in Albany, New York, with emphasis on placing teachers. He is responsible for keeping records of the professionally employed blind, such as teachers, social workers, computer programmers, and those in many other fields. He said, "I am very happy to see the increase in the number of professional positions being held by blind persons."[6] He also stated that in the

---

[6]Employment of Qualified Blind Teachers in Teaching Positions in the Public School Systems at Both the Elementary and the Secondary Grade Levels, Report Presented by the New York Association for the Blind, 1969, p. 36.

United States there are 1,940 blind people pursuing an education for professional positions; 813 of these are training to be elementary and secondary school teachers; in the 1968-1969 school year there were 334 blind teachers actively employed in public schools throughout the United States.[7]

California was the first state to revise its laws to open the doors of its public schools for blind teachers. It now has the largest number of blind teachers in the nation at 85. New York revised its laws in 1960, making it unlawful for any administrator not to hire a qualified teacher on the basis of a physical handicap. As a result of the acts of these two states, they now have the largest enrollment of blind students in college with teaching as their goal. Since 1960, 40 blind persons who received their college training and education in the state of New York have found employment in public schools. Johnston also said that there are more blind high school graduates going on to college each year and that about 40 percent are going into teaching. He also said that many male teachers go on to study for college teaching, mostly because of the lack of receptiveness at the elementary or secondary level.[8]

William H. Diehl, a Case Work Supervisor, Bureau of Visually and Physically Handicapped, Department of Public Welfare, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, researched whether or not blind people could satisfactorily carry out the duties required of a public school teacher.

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid., p. 37.

He met and interviewed blind teachers who were active in the field. This study was made in 1957, when there were few blind teachers around. Diehl said he was no longer skeptical about a blind person being able to teach, but he cautioned about the significance of the counselor's discretion in selecting candidates for teacher training. It is imperative that the teacher-training candidates show evidence of motivation, a pleasing personality, successful social adjustment, and academic aptitude. Then a cooperating college must be found that will accept the applicant--not all colleges will accept any blind student for any type of training.[9]

Edward F. Huntington, Superintendent of Schalmont Central Schools, Schenectady, New York, did a research study entitled "Administration Considerations in the Employment of Blind Teachers." This study was over a period of three years, 1964-1966. Huntington had a blind history teacher on his staff and found no serious complaints about him. The study grew out of the realization that few administrators had any idea how a blind teacher can accomplish the task of teaching. In the study a list of duties was compiled indicating the areas in which most administrators thought the greatest problems would arise. They were listed and ranked in the following order:

1. Lunchroom supervision
2. Administering tests
3. Supervising study halls

---

[9] Ibid., p. 39.

4. Chaperoning student activities

(Note that none of these four deals with the actual teaching process.)

5. Use of visual aids

6. Fire drills

7. Keeping written records

8. Discipline

There were more items offered but these eight headed the list and were indicated by over half of the 232 administrators that participated. The second phase of this study was to go out to schools already employing blind teachers. Huntington went to eight schools and interviewed administrators, other teachers, and students. He found a general picture of acceptance of the blind teacher by all three groups. He noted that not all blind teachers who sign a contract work out satisfactorily, but he did feel the rate of unsuccessful blind teachers was no worse than the rate of unsuccessful sighted teachers.

From these same interviews Huntington stated areas in which it would be most feasible for a blind teacher to work. The areas mentioned most often were ranked in this order:

1. Social Studies

2. English

3. Foreign Languages

4. Music

Huntington felt the administrator is both the key and the stumbling block to the success of employment for the blind teachers. The administrator must do the hiring, but he is hesitant to do so because he lacks the knowledge of how a blind teacher functions in the classroom and he fears that an unsuccessful teacher would reflect upon his judgment as an administrator.

Huntington suggested some areas to which both the applicant and the administrator might give special attention in preparing for their first meeting:

1. Direction of the interview
2. Frank and open discussion of blindness
3. Qualifications of applicant, such as attitude, physical mobility, grooming, social skills, dependability, and independence
4. Teaching qualifications such as academic, curriculum, tenure, criticism, supervision, and dismissal
5. The principles of teaching mechanics used by the school
6. Detailed list of all services available to the teacher
7. Labor and employment legislation regarding the hiring of blind teachers[10]

Wesley D. Spraig, Executive Director for the New York Association for the Blind, holds the philosophy that teachers, just as the students, are individuals with varying needs, skills, and interests. It is the mind of the teacher that teaches, and it is the mind of the student that absorbs knowledge. A physical impairment in the student does not disqualify him from learning any more than does a physical impairment disqualify a teacher from teaching. There is no

---

[10] Ibid., p. 42.

difference in the information the blind teachers are getting across, only a difference in the manner in which it is presented.[11]

Dr. E. B. Nyquist is Deputy Commissioner of Education, University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Albany, New York. He expressed discontent with the State Administration and the State Legislature in their consuming interest in establishing a physical fitness program while the state's education program was no longer a "money splendored thing." He goes on to say that blindness is neither a qualification nor a disqualification of a good teacher. A good teacher and good teaching are defined whether a teacher is sighted or blind. If good teaching depended upon 20/20 vision, we would have remarkably fine education in this country.

According to Nyquist, the hiring of a teacher is an act of faith and hope--faith in one's own good judgment to hire a good teacher, faith in the applicant's desire to be a good teacher, and hope that one is right and that the teacher will do good teaching and will participate in making the climate of the school conducive to good learning.

Nyquist felt the real fear in hiring teachers should be the fear of blindness of the mind. "Sight is of the mind, and he who has a mind has sight. If impaired vision has no crucial effect upon the personal characteristics we want in teachers, what are the other factors that up to now have prevented the hiring of blind teachers?"[12]

---

[11] Ibid., p. 1.

[12] Ibid., p. 3.

Huntington also emphasized some desirable characteristics sought in a good teacher. Blindness did not necessarily exclude these qualities. While agreed it takes many things to provide a good education, the teacher ranks far ahead of whatever ranks second. He quoted Aristotle as having said, "Those who teach children well are more to be honored than those who produce them, for these give them only life; those the art of living well."

Huntington commented about the "teacher-scholar" who knows his subject matter and feels at home in it. He is free to teach and does not have to perform the duties that can be done by a clerk or an aid.[13]

Figures furnished by James O'Keefe, Assistant Director, State Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped, show there are 20 blind teachers currently employed in Minnesota. The subjects taught are social studies, music, English, Foreign Languages, and wrestling.[14]

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

The early history of education for the blind in the United States was a brief one, for little was done in this area until 1832, when greater concern was shown through curriculum planning. Since the turn of the century, education for the blind has been progressing at a far more rapid rate. Most blind children are now taught in the public schools rather than in the residential schools of earlier times.

---

[13] Ibid., p. 42.

[14] Ibid., p. 62.

Trained and qualified handicapped persons, when employed, seem to enjoy employment success equal to that of non-handicapped persons. Several investigators have studied the employment of blind persons in the teaching field. Included in this research was a two-part study by Huntington which dealt with administrators' acceptance of blind teachers. A questionnaire was used, and administrators were interviewed. Huntington found there to be a general acceptance of the blind teacher by the administrators.

According to the literature reviewed, there were 334 blind teachers actively employed in public schools in the United States in 1968-1969, and 20 such teachers were employed in Minnesota during that period.

Chapter 3

METHODS

Whereas the primary focus of the study was to ascertain a general indication of attitudes held by Minnesota school administrators toward visually handicapped teachers, a number of null hypotheses were also developed:

1. Younger school administrators do not differ from older school administrators in their attitudes toward:
    a. The social competence of blind teachers.
    b. The teaching competence of blind teachers.
    c. The self-sufficiency of blind teachers.
2. The level of education of the administrator will not affect his attitude toward:
    a. The social competence of blind teachers.
    b. The teaching competence of blind teachers.
    c. The self-sufficiency of blind teachers.
3. The geographic area from which the administrator's degree was received will not influence his attitude toward:
    a. The social competence of blind teachers.
    b. The teaching competence of blind teachers.
    c. The self-sufficiency of blind teachers.

4. The type of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward:

a. The social competence of blind teachers.

b. The teaching competence of blind teachers.

c. The self-sufficiency of blind teachers.

5. The level of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward:

a. The social competence of blind teachers.

b. The teaching competence of blind teachers.

c. The self-sufficiency of blind teachers.

6. The size of community in which the administrator is working is not relevant to his attitude toward:

a. The social competence of blind teachers.

b. The teaching competence of blind teachers.

c. The self-sufficiency of blind teachers.

7. An administrator's experience with visually handicapped teachers will not influence his attitude toward:

a. The social competence of blind teachers.

b. The teaching competence of blind teachers.

c. The self-sufficiency of blind teachers.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The instrument used was an attitude-measuring questionnaire drafted by the writer to determine attitudes of administrators toward blind teachers. It had two sub-parts. One consisted of 13 descriptive

items. The other had 10 items designed to assess attitudes about blind teachers.

The 13 descriptive items are as follows:[1]

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Religious affiliation
4. Type of school from which undergraduate degree was earned
5. Highest degree
6. Geographical area
7. Official title in present position
8. Other administrative positions held outside of education
9. Fields of other administrative positions
10. Type of school under supervision
11. Level of school under supervision
12. Population of community
13. Experience working with blind teachers

The attitudes of the administrators in the sample were measured in the following three areas:

1. Social competence
    a. A blind teacher can relate professionally to other teachers as well as a sighted person.
    b. A blind teacher can be as emotionally well-adjusted as a sighted person.
    c. Blindness is not a factor in intelligence.

---

[1]See Appendix B for a complete statement of items as shown in the Survey Questionnaire.

2. Teaching competence

   a. A blind teacher can maintain classroom discipline through earned respect and teaching skills.

   b. A blind teacher can arrange a learning situation for his students.

   c. A blind teacher can bring to his students perspective on life that would be beneficial to the student.

3. Self-sufficiency

   a. A blind person can comprehend in abstractions what a sighted person comprehends visually.

   b. A blind applicant is employed on the basis of his professional credentials.

   c. Physical mobility in the classroom can be achieved by a blind person through orientation to the classroom.

   d. A guide dog or a cane is all that a blind teacher needs to get around in his school and community.

The persons responding to the questionnaire were asked to indicate on an enclosed data computer card one of the following five choices to each attitude item: strongly agree (SA), agree (A), no opinion (N), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD).

THE SAMPLE

The universe for this study was the public elementary and secondary school top administrators in the state of Minnesota. Their total number was 2,205.[2] A sample of 553 was drawn from this total. Because the list from which the sample was drawn was in alphabetical order--as based on the name of the school--it was assumed that the level of the school and the population of the community would have

---

[2]Minnesota Educational Directory, 1970-71, pp. 52-87.

no bearing on the school's position on this list. With this assumption, it seemed logical that by selecting every fourth school, the sample would include about the same proportion of each school level and population category as would exist in the total listing. To give equal chance for each school to be selected, the numbers 1 through 4 were placed in a container, and one of the numbers was drawn to determine which of the first four schools would be selected. Number 3 was picked. Beginning with the third school on the list, each subsequent fourth school was selected for the sample.

The administrator of each school selected received a copy of the Survey Questionnaire, a cover letter,[3] a data computer card, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The responses to this survey were received by the writer during the spring quarter of 1971.

The number of administrators from the sample who returned the survey instrument was 453--a gross return of 82 percent. Thirty-eight of the returns were improperly marked and had to be discarded. The net usable returns were 415--a 75 percent net return. The researcher considered this a workable return, evidenced by returns of comparable studies. So, no follow-up reminders were mailed out.

THE STATISTICAL COMPUTATIONS

A frequency distribution was compiled to determine the general attitudes of school administrators regarding the ten items of the Likert scale.

---

[3]See Appendix A.

The Chi-square analysis was used to determine relationships between seven of the items on the Survey Questionnaire to attitudes expressed on the Likert scale. A computer program for the IBM 1620 was used to run the Chi-square analysis. This analysis was considered appropriate because the researcher was attempting to show the presence or absence of a relationship between a set of qualitative or descriptive data about school administrators and their attitudes on a Likert attitude scale.

Of the 13 descriptive items in the questionnaire, six of the items did not draw enough variety in the responses to make it practical to run a Chi-square analysis and were dropped. These six were:

1. Sex (#2)
2. Religious affiliation (#3)
3. Type of school from which undergraduate degree was earned (#4)
4. Official title in present position (#7)
5. Other administrative positions held outside of education (#8)
6. Fields of other administrative positions (#9)

Of the 13 descriptive items in the questionnaire, the seven that drew enough variety in the responses to warrant running a Chi-square analysis were:

1. Age (#1)
2. Highest degree (#5)
3. Geographic area (#6)
4. Type of school under supervision (#10)

5. Level of school under supervision (#11)
6. Population of community (#12)
7. Experience working with blind teachers (#13)

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

A frequency distribution was made of the responses given by the school administrators. There was some variation among the administrators in the degree of attitude held regarding each question of the attitude scale. There was also a variation in the number of responses to each question due to incorrect or omitted responses. But, in general, a majority appeared positive toward blind teachers (Table 1).

A Chi-square analysis of the three areas built into the questionnaire; i.e., level of social competence, level of teaching competence, and level of self-sufficiency, was computed. The frequency distribution tables that follow show responses made in each of these three areas, based on each of the seven descriptive items shown significant in the Chi-square analysis.

Since the computed Chi-square of 6.91 (Table 2) is less than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that younger school administrators do not differ from older school administrators in their attitudes toward the social competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. An examination of Table 2 shows that in the area of social competence, the greatest percentage that strongly agree are the administrators under age 30 (50.0%). No administrators under age 30 disagree or strongly disagree. Totals

Table 1. Number and Percentage of Responses to Each Degree of Attitude.

Survey Item No.*	SA No.	SA %	A No.	A %	N No.	N %	D No.	D %	SD No.	SD %	Total No.
Social Competence											
14	124	30.3	222	54.3	43	10.5	18	4.4	2	.5	409
15	166	40.9	216	53.2	20	4.9	4	1.0	0	0.0	406
16	290	71.8	92	22.8	13	3.2	7	1.7	2	.5	404
Teaching Competence											
17	60	14.7	193	47.4	109	26.8	43	10.6	2	.5	407
18	81	20.1	268	66.7	48	11.9	5	1.2	0	0.0	402
19	135	34.5	224	57.3	30	7.7	1	.3	1	.3	391
Self-Sufficiency											
20	33	8.4	161	41.2	172	44.0	25	6.4	0	0.0	391
21	41	10.2	186	46.2	118	29.3	50	12.4	8	2.0	403
22	85	21.9	248	63.9	39	10.1	15	3.9	1	.3	388
23	37	9.5	128	32.9	132	33.9	80	20.6	12	3.1	389
TOTALS											
Social Competence	580	47.6	530	43.5	76	6.2	29	2.4	4	.3	1,219
Teaching Competence	276	23.0	685	57.1	187	15.6	49	4.1	3	.3	1,200
Self-Sufficiency	196	12.5	723	46.0	461	29.3	170	10.8	21	1.3	1,571
All Areas	1,052	26.4	1,938	48.6	724	18.1	248	6.2	28	.7	3,990

*For a complete statement of each item number listed, see the Survey Questionnaire, Appendix B.

Table 2. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Age

Age	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Under 30	(36)	50.0	(29)	40.3	(7)	9.7	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(72)
30-40	(200)	45.1	(198)	44.7	(31)	7.0	(12)	2.7	(2)	.5	(443)
40-50	(201)	48.8	(175)	42.5	(23)	5.6	(12)	2.9	(1)	.2	(412)
Over 50	(135)	48.7	(121)	43.7	(15)	5.4	(5)	1.8	(1)	.4	(277)
Total	(572)	47.5	(523)	43.4	(76)	6.3	(29)	2.4	(4)	.3	(1,204)

$X^2 = 6.91$; $X^2_{.01}\ (12) = 26.217$; $X^2_{.05}\ (12) = 21.026$

show a rapidly descending pattern from strongly agree (47.5%) through strongly disagree (.3%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 16.19 (Table 3) is less than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that younger school administrators do not differ from older school administrators in their attitudes toward the teaching competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Table 3 shows that a greater percentage of administrators under age 30 (32.4%) strongly agree in the area of teaching competence than those in any other age group; however, the highest percentages for all groups occur in the agree column (ranging from 54.9% to 61.0%). In looking at the disagree and strongly disagree columns together, the smallest percentage disagreeing to any extent are the under-age-30 group (2.8%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 22.58 (Table 4) is less than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that younger school administrators do not differ from older school administrators in their attitudes toward the self-sufficiency of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. There are higher no-opinion percentages in the area of self-sufficiency, based on age (29.2%), than in either Table 2 or Table 3. There are also smaller strongly agree percentages (12.6%) in this area than in the competence areas. Again, the under-age-30 administrators show less disagreement than do older administrator groups (5.4%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 20.52 (Table 5) is less than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that the level of education of the administrator will not affect his attitude toward the

Table 3. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Age

Age	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Under 30	(23)	32.4	(39)	54.9	(7)	9.9	(2)	2.8	(0)	0.0	(71)
30-40	(92)	21.0	(241)	54.9	(85)	19.4	(19)	4.3	(2)	.5	(439)
40-50	(102)	24.9	(234)	57.1	(55)	13.4	(19)	4.6	(0)	0.0	(410)
Over 50	(57)	21.3	(163)	61.0	(38)	14.2	(8)	3.0	(1)	.4	(267)
Total	(274)	23.1	(677)	57.0	(185)	15.6	(48)	4.0	(3)	.3	(1,187)

$X^2 = 16.19$; $X^2_{.01}\ (12) = 26.217$; $X^2_{.05}\ (12) = 21.026$

Table 4. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Age

Age	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Under 30	(20)	21.7	(41)	44.6	(24)	26.1	(5)	5.4	(2)	2.2	(92)
30-40	(65)	11.3	(242)	42.1	(193)	33.6	(67)	11.7	(8)	1.4	(575)
40-50	(72)	13.6	(250)	47.3	(143)	27.0	(56)	10.6	(8)	1.5	(529)
Over 50	(39)	10.8	(183)	50.7	(94)	26.0	(42)	11.6	(3)	.8	(361)
Total	(196)	12.6	(716)	46.0	(454)	29.2	(170)	10.9	(21)	1.3	(1,557)

$X^2 = 22.58$; $X^2_{.01}\ (12) = 26.217$; $X^2_{.05}\ (12) = 21.026$

Table 5. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of Education

Highest Degree	SA No.	SA %	A No.	A %	N No.	N %	D No.	D %	SD No.	SD %	Total No.
B.S.	(78)	49.4	(68)	43.0	(10)	6.3	(1)	.6	(1)	.6	(158)
Masters	(461)	48.2	(406)	42.5	(62)	6.5	(25)	2.6	(2)	.2	(956)
Ph.D. or Ed.D.	(18)	51.4	(15)	42.9	(0)	0.0	(1)	2.9	(1)	2.9	(35)
Other	(16)	35.6	(27)	60.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	4.4	(0)	0.0	(45)
Total	(573)	48.0	(516)	43.2	(72)	6.0	(29)	2.4	(4)	.3	(1,194)

$X^2 = 20.52$; $X^2_{.01}\ (12) = 26.217$; $X^2_{.05}\ (12) = 21.026$

social competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Most administrators held a Master's degree. Ph.D. or Ed.D., or other degree holders in the sample are least indecisive, showing no no-opinion responses. A higher percentage of other degree holders agree (60.0%) in this area than do administrators at any other level of education.

Since the computed Chi-square of 9.41 (Table 6) is less than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that the level of education of the administrator will not affect his attitude toward the teaching competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. A greater percentage of respondents at each level of education agree to questions on teaching competence (57.3% total) than strongly agree (22.9%). The highest percentage to strongly agree are Ph.D. or Ed.D. administrators (30.6%). The only group to strongly disagree are those at the Master's level (.2%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 29.37 (Table 7) is greater than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that the level of education of the administrator will not affect his attitude toward the self-sufficiency of blind teachers must be rejected at the .01 level of significance. This means that there is a significant difference in the responses of school administrators at various levels of educational attainment. The responses to self-sufficiency questions show that all administrators, regardless of level of education, are apt to be most indecisive in this area (28.9%). Again, the Ph.D. or Ed.D. group is most likely to strongly agree (29.2%) than any other group. They are, however, also most likely to disagree (14.6%)

Table 6. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of Education

Highest Degree	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
B.S.	(45)	28.7	(85)	54.1	(23)	14.6	(4)	2.5	(0)	0.0	(157)
Masters	(204)	21.7	(542)	57.7	(151)	16.1	(41)	4.4	(2)	.2	(940)
Ph.D. or Ed.D.	(11)	30.6	(21)	58.3	(4)	11.1	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(36)
Other	(9)	20.5	(27)	61.4	(5)	11.4	(3)	6.8	(0)	0.0	(44)
Total	(269)	22.9	(675)	57.3	(183)	15.5	(48)	4.1	(2)	.2	(1,177)

$X^2 = 9.41$; $X^2_{.01}(12) = 26.217$; $X^2_{.05}(12) = 21.026$

Table 7. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of Education

Highest Degree	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
B.S.	(27)	13.1	(96)	46.6	(57)	27.7	(18)	8.7	(8)	3.9	(206)
Masters	(150)	12.1	(576)	46.6	(361)	29.2	(136)	11.0	(12)	1.0	(1,235)
Ph.D. or Ed.D.	(14)	29.2	(14)	29.2	(13)	27.1	(7)	14.6	(0)	0.0	(48)
Other	(4)	7.1	(28)	50.0	(15)	26.8	(8)	14.3	(1)	1.8	(56)
Total	(195)	12.6	(714)	46.2	(446)	28.9	(169)	10.9	(21)	1.4	(1,545)

$X^2 = 29.37$; $X^2_{.01}\ (12) = 26.217$; $X^2_{.05}\ (12) = 21.026$

but not strongly disagree (0.0%). Those with B.S. degrees are most likely to strongly disagree (3.9%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 25.89 (Table 8) is less than the table Chi-square of 32.000, the null hypothesis that the geographic area from which the administrator's degree was received will not influence his attitude toward the social competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Most administrators received their highest degree from a midwestern college or university. Table 8 shows that eastern graduates are most likely to strongly agree on social competence questions (61.9%). Southeastern graduates are most likely to agree (66.7%), while southwestern graduates show the greatest percentage of no-opinion responses (10.0%). The upper midwestern graduates' responses are shown to be distributed across the board, but with the greatest percentages being positive responses (strongly agree, 47.7%; agree, 43.5%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 14.18 (Table 9) is less than the table Chi-square of 32.000, the null hypothesis that the geographic area from which the administrator's degree was received will not influence his attitude toward the teaching competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. In Table 9, eastern graduates are most likely to strongly agree to teaching competence questions (47.4%). Upper midwestern graduates show the highest percentage of agreement (58.4%) and are also the only group to show any strong disagreement (.2%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 14.50 (Table 10) is less than the table Chi-square of 32.000, the null hypothesis that the geographic

Table 8. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Geographical Area in Which Degree Was Received

Geographical Area	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Eastern	(13)	61.9	(7)	33.3	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(1)	4.8	(21)
Western	(41)	56.2	(28)	38.4	(3)	4.1	(1)	1.4	(0)	0.0	(73)
Southeastern	(9)	30.0	(20)	66.7	(1)	3.3	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(30)
Upper Midwestern	(490)	47.7	(447)	43.5	(63)	6.1	(25)	2.4	(3)	.3	(1,028)
Southwestern	(14)	46.7	(12)	40.0	(3)	10.0	(1)	3.3	(0)	0.0	(30)
Total	(567)	48.0	(514)	43.5	(70)	5.9	(27)	2.3	(4)	.3	(1,182)

$X^2 = 25.89$; $X^2_{.01}\ (16) = 32.000$; $X^2_{.05}\ (16) = 26.296$

Table 9. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Geographical Area in Which Degree Was Received

Geographical Area	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Eastern	(9)	47.4	(7)	36.8	(2)	10.5	(1)	5.3	(0)	0.0	(19)
Western	(14)	18.4	(43)	56.6	(15)	19.7	(4)	5.3	(0)	0.0	(76)
Southeastern	(9)	31.0	(15)	51.7	(4)	13.8	(1)	3.4	(0)	0.0	(29)
Upper Midwestern	(223)	22.0	(592)	58.4	(155)	15.3	(42)	4.1	(2)	.2	(1,014)
Southwestern	(10)	33.3	(14)	46.7	(6)	20.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(30)
Total	(265)	22.7	(671)	57.4	(182)	15.6	(48)	4.1	(2)	.2	(1,168)

$X^2 = 14.18$; $X^2_{.01}\ (16) = 32.000$; $X^2_{.05}\ (16) = 26.296$

Table 10. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Geographical Area in Which Degree Was Received

Geographical Area	SA No.	SA %	A No.	A %	N No.	N %	D No.	D %	SD No.	SD %	Total No.
Eastern	(4)	15.4	(13)	50.0	(6)	23.1	(2)	7.7	(1)	3.8	(26)
Western	(12)	12.2	(43)	43.9	(32)	32.7	(11)	11.2	(0)	0.0	(98)
Southeastern	(5)	13.5	(16)	43.2	(15)	40.5	(1)	2.7	(0)	0.0	(37)
Upper Midwestern	(163)	12.3	(621)	46.9	(371)	28.0	(150)	11.3	(18)	1.4	(1,323)
Southwestern	(8)	20.0	(13)	32.5	(15)	37.5	(3)	7.5	(1)	2.5	(40)
Total	(192)	12.6	(706)	46.3	(439)	28.8	(167)	11.0	(20)	1.3	(1,524)

$X^2 = 14.50$; $X^2_{.01}$ (16) = 32.000; $X^2_{.05}$ (16) = 26.296

area from which the administrator's degree was received will not influence his attitude toward the self-sufficiency of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Southwestern graduates show the highest percentage of strong agreement in self-sufficiency questions (20.0%); the highest percentage showing agreement are the eastern graduates (50.0%). The most indecisive are the southeastern graduates (40.5%). Western and southeastern graduates show no strong disagreement.

Since the computed Chi-square of 5.57 (Table 11) is less than the table Chi-square of 20.090, the null hypothesis that the type of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward the social competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Nearly half of all respondents, based on type of school, show strong agreement to social competence questions (47.6%). Another 43.3% show agreement. The inner city administrators are most likely to strongly agree (53.1%), yet least likely to agree (37.7%). Rural consolidated administrators are most likely to have no opinion (7.2%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 12.32 (Table 12) is less than the table Chi-square of 20.090, the null hypothesis that the type of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward the teaching competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Over half of all respondents, based on type of school, show agreement to teaching competence questions (57.8%); the rural consolidated administrators are most likely to make this response (60.1%). The suburban administrators are most likely to

Table 11. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Type of School

Type of School	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Inner City	(93)	53.1	(66)	37.7	(10)	5.7	(5)	2.9	(1)	.6	(175)
Suburban	(169)	48.3	(155)	44.3	(17)	4.9	(8)	2.3	(1)	.3	(350)
Rural Consolidated	(294)	45.8	(284)	44.2	(46)	7.2	(16)	2.5	(2)	.3	(642)
Total	(556)	47.6	(505)	43.3	(73)	6.3	(29)	2.5	(4)	.3	(1,167)

$X^2 = 5.57$; $X^2_{.01}(8) = 20.090$; $X^2_{.05}(8) = 15.507$

Table 12. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Type of School

Type of School	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Inner City	(44)	24.9	(99)	55.9	(25)	14.1	(9)	5.1	(0)	0.0	(177)
Suburban	(71)	20.6	(187)	54.4	(65)	18.9	(20)	5.8	(1)	.3	(344)
Rural Consolidated	(145)	22.9	(380)	60.1	(87)	13.8	(18)	2.8	(2)	.3	(632)
Total	(260)	22.5	(666)	57.8	(177)	15.4	(47)	4.1	(3)	.3	(1,153)

$X^2 = 12.32$; $X^2_{.01}$ (8) = 20.090; $X^2_{.05}$ (8) = 15.507

have no opinion (18.9%), and only the inner city administrators show no strong disagreement.

Since the computed Chi-square of 14.95 (Table 13) is less than the table Chi-square of 20.090, the null hypothesis that the type of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward the self-sufficiency of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Inner-city respondents are most likely to strongly agree to self-sufficiency questions (14.5%), although the percentage is not high. They are also most likely to agree (47.9%) although rural consolidated administrators also agree at about the same percentage (47.2%). The inner-city group is least likely to strongly disagree (.9%). Rural consolidated administrators show the greatest no-opinion percentage (30.6%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 8.96 (Table 14) is less than the table Chi-square of 20.090, the null hypothesis that the level of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward the social competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Junior high administrators show the highest percentage of strong agreement (50.2%), but senior high administrators show the highest percentage of agreement (44.4%), indecisiveness (9.0%), and disagreement (3.0%). The senior high administrators, however, are the only group to show no strong disagreement.

Since the computed Chi-square of 5.54 (Table 15) is less than the table Chi-square of 20.090, the null hypothesis that the level of

Table 13. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Type of School

Type of School	SA No.	SA %	A No.	A %	N No.	N %	D No.	D %	SD No.	SD %	Total No.
Inner City	(34)	14.5	(112)	47.9	(55)	23.5	(31)	13.2	(2)	.9	(234)
Suburban	(56)	12.3	(200)	44.0	(129)	28.4	(64)	14.1	(6)	1.3	(455)
Rural Consolidated	(99)	11.9	(393)	47.2	(255)	30.6	(72)	8.7	(13)	1.6	(832)
Total	(189)	12.4	(705)	46.4	(439)	28.9	(167)	11.0	(21)	1.4	(1,521)

$X^2 = 14.95$; $X^2_{.01}\ (8) = 20.090$; $X^2_{.05}\ (8) = 15.507$

Table 14. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of School

Level of School	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Elementary	(280)	48.0	(254)	43.6	(34)	5.8	(12)	2.1	(3)	.5	(583)
Junior High	(164)	50.2	(140)	42.8	(14)	4.3	(8)	2.4	(1)	.3	(327)
Senior High	(117)	43.7	(119)	44.4	(24)	9.0	(8)	3.0	(0)	0.0	(268)
Total	(561)	47.6	(513)	43.5	(72)	6.1	(28)	2.4	(4)	.3	(1,178)

$X^2 = 8.96$; $X^2_{.01}\ (8) = 20.090$; $X^2_{.05}\ (8) = 15.507$

Table 15. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of School

Level of School	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Elementary	(119)	20.9	(326)	57.3	(96)	16.9	(27)	4.7	(1)	.2	(569)
Junior High	(76)	23.4	(188)	57.8	(47)	14.5	(12)	3.7	(2)	.6	(325)
Senior High	(59)	22.3	(158)	59.6	(40)	15.1	(8)	3.0	(0)	0.0	(265)
Total	(254)	21.9	(672)	58.0	(183)	15.8	(47)	4.1	(3)	.3	(1,159)

$X^2 = 5.54$; $X^2_{.01}$ (8) = 20.090; $X^2_{.05}$ (8) = 15.507

school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward the teaching competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Over half of all respondents, based on level of school, agree to teaching competence questions (58.0%). The senior high group again shows the highest percentage of agreement (59.6%), but the elementary group shows the greatest percentage of no-opinion responses (16.9%) and disagreement (4.7%). Senior high administrators are the only group, once again, to show no strong disagreement.

Since the computed Chi-square of 12.34 (Table 16) is less than the table Chi-square of 20.090, the null hypothesis that the level of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward the self-sufficiency of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. The percentages for strong agreement to self-sufficiency in Table 16 are consistently low (12.3% total), while those percentages for agreement are consistently quite high (46.0% total). The no-opinion percentages are also quite consistent (29.4% total). Elementary administrators are most likely to disagree (12.6%) and strongly disagree (2.1%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 15.08 (Table 17) is less than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that the size of community in which the administrator is working is not relevant to his attitude toward the social competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Administrators in the largest communities (over 30,000 population) are most likely to strongly agree to social competence questions (53.7%). However, administrators

Table 16. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Level of School

Level of School	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	Total No.
Elementary	(90)	12.0	(333)	44.5	(215)	28.7	(94)	12.6	(16)	2.1	(748)
Junior High	(55)	12.8	(203)	47.2	(129)	30.0	(40)	9.3	(3)	.7	(430)
Senior High	(43)	12.3	(167)	47.7	(105)	30.0	(34)	9.7	(1)	.3	(350)
Total	(188)	12.3	(703)	46.0	(449)	29.4	(168)	11.0	(20)	1.3	(1,528)

$X^2 = 12.34$; $X^2_{.01}(8) = 20.090$; $X^2_{.05}(8) = 15.507$

Table 17. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Population of Community

Population	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Under 2,000	(153)	41.9	(168)	46.0	(31)	8.5	(11)	3.0	(2)	.5	(365)
2,000-10,000	(138)	48.1	(122)	42.5	(18)	6.3	(8)	2.8	(1)	.3	(287)
10,000-30,000	(125)	49.8	(108)	43.0	(14)	5.6	(4)	1.6	(0)	0.0	(251)
Over 30,000	(158)	53.7	(118)	40.1	(12)	4.1	(5)	1.7	(1)	.3	(294)
Total	(574)	48.0	(516)	43.1	(75)	6.3	(28)	2.3	(4)	.3	(1,197)

$X^2 = 15.08$; $X^2_{.01}\ (12) = 26.217$; $X^2_{.05}\ (12) = 21.026$

in the smallest communities (under 2,000 population) are most likely to agree (46.0%), have no opinion (8.5%), disagree (3.0%), and strongly disagree (.5%). Least likely to strongly disagree are administrators in communities of 10,000-30,000 population (0.0%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 12.95 (Table 18) is less than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that the size of community in which the administrator is working is not relevant to his attitude toward the teaching competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. The trend shown in Table 17 does not pervade Table 18. Here, the highest percentage of strong agreement is found in communities of 10,000-30,000 population (26.8%). The administrators in communities of 2,000-10,000 population are most likely to agree (63.3%), while those in the largest communities (over 30,000 population) are most likely to have no opinion in teaching competence questions (17.2%). Administrators located in the largest communities (over 30,000 population) have the highest percentage of disagreement (6.1%), but are the only administrators to show no strong disagreement.

Since the computed Chi-square of 19.78 (Table 19) is less than the table Chi-square of 26.217, the null hypothesis that the size of community in which the administrator is working is not relevant to his attitude toward the self-sufficiency of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance. Table 19 shows that administrators in the largest communities (over 30,000 population) are most likely to strongly agree with questions of self-sufficiency (14.8%) as well as most likely to disagree (13.5%). The administrators in

Table 18. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Population of Community

Population	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Under 2,000	(80)	22.8	(203)	57.8	(55)	15.7	(12)	3.4	(1)	.3	(351)
2,000-10,000	(55)	19.6	(178)	63.3	(38)	13.5	(9)	3.2	(1)	.4	(281)
10,000-30,000	(67)	26.8	(136)	54.4	(38)	15.2	(8)	3.2	(1)	.4	(250)
Over 30,000	(71)	23.9	(157)	52.9	(51)	17.2	(18)	6.1	(0)	0.0	(297)
Total	(273)	23.2	(674)	57.2	(182)	15.4	(47)	4.0	(3)	.3	(1,179)

$X^2 = 12.95$; $X^2_{.01}$ (12) = 26.217; $X^2_{.05}$ (12) = 21.026

Table 19. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Population of Community

Population	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Under 2,000	(49)	10.7	(209)	45.4	(142)	30.9	(52)	11.3	(8)	1.7	(460)
2,000-10,000	(44)	12.1	(156)	42.7	(115)	31.5	(44)	12.1	(6)	1.6	(365)
10,000-30,000	(43)	13.3	(163)	50.3	(95)	29.3	(20)	6.2	(3)	.9	(324)
Over 30,000	(58)	14.8	(180)	45.8	(98)	24.9	(53)	13.5	(4)	1.0	(393)
Total	(194)	12.6	(708)	45.9	(450)	29.2	(169)	11.0	(21)	1.4	(1,542)

$X^2 = 19.78$; $X^2_{.01}$ (12) = 26.217; $X^2_{.05}$ (12) = 21.026

communities of 10,000-30,000 population are most likely to agree in this area (50.3%), and administrators in the two smaller groups (under 2,000 and 2,000-10,000 population) show more strong disagreement (1.7% and 1.6%, respectively) than do administrators in the two larger communities (10,000-30,000 and over 30,000 population), which show percentages of .9% and 1.0%, respectively.

Since the computed Chi-square of 18.34 (Table 20) is greater than the table Chi-square of 13.277, the null hypothesis that an administrator's experience with visually handicapped teachers will not influence his attitude toward the social competence of blind teachers must be rejected at the .01 level of significance. This means that there is a significant difference in the responses of those school administrators who have had experience working with blind teachers as compared with those who have not. Few administrators have had experience working with blind teachers. Administrators who have had such experience are more likely to strongly agree with social competence questions (69.2%) than those who have had no experience. However, a greater percentage of those with no experience agree to questions in this area (44.9%). No administrators with experience show indecisiveness, and none of them strongly disagrees. Those with no experience are more likely to disagree (2.4%).

Since the computed Chi-square of 12.42 (Table 21) is less than the table Chi-square of 13.277, the null hypothesis that an administrator's experience with visually handicapped teachers will not influence his attitude toward the teaching competence of blind teachers cannot be rejected at the .01 level of significance.

Table 20. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Social Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Experience Working with Blind Teachers

Experience	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Yes	(54)	69.2	(23)	29.5	(0)	0.0	(1)	1.3	(0)	0.0	(78)
No	(505)	45.7	(496)	44.9	(74)	6.7	(26)	2.4	(4)	.4	(1,105)
Total	(559)	47.3	(519)	43.9	(74)	6.3	(27)	2.3	(4)	.3	(1,183)

$X^2 = 18.34$; $X^2_{.01}$ (4) = 13.277; $X^2_{.05}$ (4) = 11.071

Table 21. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Teaching Competence of Blind Teachers, Based on Experience Working with Blind Teachers

Experience	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Yes	(28)	35.4	(40)	50.6	(6)	7.6	(5)	6.3	(0)	0.0	(79)
No	(230)	21.2	(632)	58.2	(178)	16.4	(42)	3.9	(3)	.3	(1,085)
Total	(258)	22.2	(672)	57.7	(184)	15.8	(47)	4.0	(3)	.3	(1,164)

$X^2 = 12.42$; $X^2_{.01}$ (4) = 13.277; $X^2_{.05}$ (4) = 11.071

Administrators with experience are more likely to strongly agree (35.4%), but they are also more likely to disagree (6.3%). Administrators without experience show more indecisiveness (16.4%), and again those administrators with experience show no strong disagreement.

Since the computed Chi-square of 17.09 (Table 22) is greater than the table Chi-square of 13.277, the null hypothesis that an administrator's experience with visually handicapped teachers will not influence his attitude toward the self-sufficiency of blind teachers must be rejected at the .01 level of significance. This means that there is a significant difference in the responses of those school administrators who have had experience working with blind teachers as compared with those who have not. In Table 22, the administrators with experiences once again show a greater percentage of strong agreement (24.0%), this time to self-sufficiency questions; and those without experience show a greater percentage of agreement (47.0%). Administrators without experience are more likely to be indecisive (29.6%); and again, as in Table 21, administrators with experience are more likely to disagree (15.6%).

A comparison of tables and groups of tables reveals some general trends in the data.

In the area of social competence, regardless of the basis for the table, the strongly agree response is most likely to occur. However, in the area of self-sufficiency, this strongly agree response becomes a very low percentage, while the disagree response grows greater;

Table 22. Chi-Square Analysis of Attitudes of School Administrators Toward Self-Sufficiency of Blind Teachers, Based on Experience Working with Blind Teachers

Experience	SA		A		N		D		SD		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Yes	(23)	24.0	(36)	37.5	(21)	21.9	(15)	15.6	(1)	1.0	(96)
No	(165)	11.5	(671)	47.0	(423)	29.6	(150)	10.5	(20)	1.4	(1,429)
Total	(188)	12.3	(707)	46.4	(444)	29.1	(165)	10.8	(21)	1.4	(1,525)

$X^2 = 17.09$; $X^2_{.01}(4) = 13.277$; $X^2_{.05}(4) = 11.071$

the teaching competence strongly agree response is shown to be midway between the extremes. In the areas of teaching competence and self-sufficiency, the agree response is the most frequently occurring.

The strongly disagree response remains at the lowest percentage in all of the tables.

The indecisiveness shown by the no-opinion response grows; it is the lowest in the social competence area and increases to its highest level in the self-sufficiency area.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION

SUMMARY

In rehabilitating the handicapped person, there are three major phases to be considered. The first is the evaluation of the individual as to his potential. The second is to find the facilities and personnel where the student can be trained and educated for a particular vocation. The third phase is to find employment after the client has been duly trained and educated. This study was concerned with the third phase.

If a client has been evaluated, trained and educated, but not employed, the process of rehabilitation has not been completed. This writer was interested in examining the rehabilitation potential of the blind, and particularly those preparing to become teachers.

School administrators are key people in the employment of teachers. It seemed important to learn their attitudes about blind teachers.

This researcher was interested to know how administrators, in general, accept blind teachers and if administrators of varying characteristics have different attitudes about blind teachers. A questionnaire was designed to determine attitudes based on age, highest degree held, the geographical area where degree was earned, the type of school in which the administrator was located, the level of his school, the population of the community in which he worked, and

whether or not he had any experience working with blind teachers. The questionnaire also included a ten-item attitude scale, which was designed and mailed to 553 administrators in Minnesota. A total of 453 responded, but 38 had to be rejected because of improper marking. A net of 415, or 75 percent of those questioned, was used in the tally.

A frequency distribution was made to compare the attitudes by groups based on the seven characteristics stated above.

The findings indicated some variations in the attitudes of the administrators based on the descriptive items. The greatest difference noted seems to be related to the degree of experience administrators had with blind teachers. Those who have had experience with blind teachers were more decisive and responded with higher percentages in the strongly agree and strongly disagree columns and least in the no-opinion column.

There was consistency among the administrators as to confidence in different areas of competence. In all groups surveyed, the responses to the scale items dealing with social competence were most positive. The items dealing with teaching competence were slightly less positive. The area receiving the least positive responses was in self-sufficiency.

All items on the attitude questionnaire received a majority of positive responses. The combined responses which agreed or strongly agreed, in all cases, exceeded the combined responses which disagreed, strongly disagreed, or showed no opinion. It also holds true that of the groups questioned, not one category showed up contrary to this pattern.

A summary of the Chi-square analysis follows:

The null hypotheses that younger school administrators do not differ from older school administrators in their attitudes toward the social competence, teaching competence, and self-sufficiency of blind teachers could not be rejected.

The null hypotheses that the level of education of the administrator will not affect his attitude toward the social competence and teaching competence of blind teachers could not be rejected. However, the null hypothesis that the level of education of the administrator will not affect his attitude toward the self-sufficiency of blind teachers was rejected.

The null hypotheses that the geographic area from which the administrator's degree was received will not influence his attitude toward the social competence, teaching competence, and self-sufficiency of blind teachers could not be rejected.

The null hypotheses that the type of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward the social competence, teaching competence, and self-sufficiency of blind teachers could not be rejected.

The null hypotheses that the level of school in which the administrator is located has no bearing on his attitude toward the social competence, teaching competence, and self-sufficiency of blind teachers could not be rejected.

The null hypotheses that the size of community in which the administrator is working is not relevant to his attitude toward the

social competence, teaching competence, and self-sufficiency of blind teachers could not be rejected.

The null hypotheses that an administrator's experience with visually handicapped teachers will not influence his attitude toward the social competence and self-sufficiency of blind teachers were rejected. However, the null hypothesis that an administrator's experience with visually handicapped teachers will not influence his attitude toward the teaching competence of blind teachers could not be rejected.

CONCLUSION

The primary focus of this study was to ascertain a general indication of attitudes held by school administrators in the state of Minnesota toward blind teachers. This writer assumes that the strong positive responses to the questionnaire constitute a favorable attitude toward blind teachers.

It seems that in the rehabilitation of the blind person who aspires to be a teacher, the first two phases of the process take on a greater significance; that is, evaluating the individual as to his motivations, social adjustment, and basic intelligence, and the phase of finding suitable training and educational facilities. Having accomplished these two steps, it seems likely that there are enough administrators with positive attitudes to give the blind teacher an opportunity in his chosen profession.

RECOMMENDATION

When a school administrator employs a teacher, it is hoped the teacher will develop good working relationships with his colleagues, as well as good student-teacher relationships. It might, therefore, be of interest to conduct further studies at the schools now employing blind teachers. Attitudes of the faculty, students, and administrators toward the blind teachers could be measured.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Dear Administrator,

This is a survey of public school administrators in the state of Minnesota. You have been selected as one of the 553 randomly drawn administrators.

I am a graduate assistant in the Department of Education at Moorhead State College. In the past four years this department has had several applications for the teacher training program by blind persons. The department feels it would be beneficial to know something about the attitudes of school administrators toward blind teachers to assess the possibility of their future placement.

If you would take a few minutes to fill in the enclosed questionnaire giving us your attitudes and return it to me in the stamped self-addressed envelope enclosed, I would greatly appreciate it. All information will be kept in strictest confidence.

Your participation in this survey will be of significant value to this department and I thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Raymond Restad
Department of Education

RR:rm
Enclosure

APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please indicate the appropriate category on the enclosed computer card by marking the appropriate oval heavily with a #2 or softer lead pencil.

1. Age a) under 30 b) 30-40 c) 40-50 d) over 50

2. Sex a) Male b) Female

3. If you wish to answer, what is your religious affiliation:

   a) Protestant b) Catholic c) Jewish d) Other e) None

4. In what type school did you get your undergraduate degree?

   a) Public University b) Public College c) Private University
   d) Private College

5. What is your highest degree?

   a) BS b) Masters c) Ph.D. or Ed.D. d) other

6. From what geographical area did you receive this degree?

   a) Eastern b) Western c) Southeastern d) Upper midwestern
   e) Southwestern

7. What is your official title in your present position?

   a) Superintendent b) Ass't. Superintendent c) Principal
   d) Ass't. Principal e) Personnel Director

8. Have you held an administrative position in any field other than education?

   a) Yes b) No

9. If Yes on the above question, please state in which area:

   a) business b) industry c) government d) military
   e) religious

10. Please check the type of school under your supervision:

    a) inner/city b) suburban c) rural consolidated

11. Please check the level of the school under your supervision:

    a) elementary b) junior high c) senior high

12. The population of your community is:

    a) under 2,000 b) 2,000 - 10,000 c) 10,000 - 30,000
    d) over 30,000

13. Have you had any experience working with blind teachers?

    a) Yes b) No

a) SA - Strongly Agree
b) A - Agree
c) N - No Opinion
d) D - Disagree
e) SD - Strongly Disagree

LIKERT SCALE STATEMENTS

a) SA b) A c) N d) D e) SD

Directions: Please indicate your opinion on the following statements by marking a, b, c, d, or e on the computer card.

14. A blind teacher can relate professionally to other teachers as well as a sighted person.

15. A blind teacher can be as emotionally well-adjusted as a sighted person.

16. Blindness is not a factor in intelligence.

17. A blind teacher can maintain classroom discipline through earned respect and teaching skills.

18. A blind teacher can arrange a learning situation for his students.

19. A blind teacher can bring to his students perspective on life that would be beneficial to the student.

20. A blind person can comprehend in abstractions what a sighted person comprehends visually.

21. You would consider employing a blind applicant on the basis of his professional credentials.

22. Physical mobility in the classroom can be achieved by a blind person through orientation to the classroom.

23. A guide dog or a cane is all that a blind teacher needs to get around in his school and community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bauman, Mary K., and Norman M. Yoder. Placing the Blind and Visually Handicapped in Professional Occupations. Washington, D.C.: Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1, 1962.

Best, Harry. History of Education of the Blind in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934.

Chuvigny, Hector, and Sidel Braverman. The Adjustment of the Blind. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1950.

Employment of Qualified Blind Teachers in Teaching Positions in the Public School Systems at Both the Elementary and the Secondary Grade Levels. Report Presented by the New York Association for the Blind, 1969.

Farrell, Gabriel. The Story of Blindness. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Lowenfeld, Burthold. "The Social Impact of Blindness upon the Individual," The New Outlook for the Blind, 58:273-77, November, 1964.

Minnesota Education Directory, 1970-71.

Reader's Digest Great Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1967, p. 1134.